



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,470	05/17/2005	Peter Jan Slikkerveer	259350	6155
23460	7590	04/02/2009	EXAMINER	
LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900 180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE CHICAGO, IL 60601-6731			MA, CALVIN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
		2629		
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
04/02/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/535,470	Applicant(s) SLIKKERVEER ET AL.
	Examiner CALVIN C. MA	Art Unit 2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-6-9,11,12 and 19-23 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 1,6-9 and 19 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 11,12 and 20-23 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on 1/21/2009 has been entered and considered, the prior art Hack et al USPG Pub: 2002/0030647.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 11-12 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawyer USPG Pub. 2004/0052037 in view of Hack et al USPG Pub. 2002/0030647.

As to claim 22, Sawyer teaches a display assembly (200) comprising:
a flexible display device being rollable around at least one axis between a rolled-up and an unrolled state (i.e. the display is rollable around the perpendicular axis of scroll 218) (see Fig. 9), the flexible display having a front side and a back side, one of the sides of the flexible display being provided with distance elements (208) for preventing a direct contact between the front side and the back side of the flexible display, and wherein the distance element comprise a protection foil with a surface

having a soft surface that touches the front side of the flexible display in the rolled-up state (i.e. since the foil can bend with the display 102 it is soft) (see Fig. 9-10, [0039], [0040]).

Even though Sawyer shows in the Fig. 9 a metal bar for the purpose of protection of the flexible display; Hack teaches a flexible material in the display such as aluminum foil (see Hack [0060]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized a flexible metal protective foil material of Hack in to the display support system of Sawyer in order to allow the flexible display system to be extended to an OLED based design (see Hack [0003]).

As to claim 23, Sawyer teaches a display assembly according to claim 22 wherein the protection foils (108) is connected to the back side of the display (i.e. the protection bar sized foil is connected to the back of the display 102) (see Fig. 4, [0032]).

As to claim 11, Sawyer teaches a flexible display assembly according to claim 22, wherein the display assembly further comprises guiding means (222) for guiding the protection foil when the assembly is being rolled into the unrolled state, such that the front side of the display is not covered by the protection foil (i.e. the handle bar consists of the guiding means by which is display is placed into unrolled state and there fore having the front of the display not cover by the protection foil 208) (see Fig. 10, [0039],

[0040]).

As to claim 12, Sawyer teaches a flexible display assembly according to claim 11, wherein the protection foil is connected to the back side of the display (see Fig. 9-10, [0039], [0040]).

4. Claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawyer USPG Pub. 2004/0052037 in view of Radley-Smith USP 7209114.

As to claim 20, Sawyer teaches a flexible display device assembly comprising: a flexible display being rollable around at least one axis between a rolled-up and an unrolled state (i.e. the display scrolling into the housing) (see Sawyer, Fig. 9), the flexible display having a front side and a back side (i.e. the bar is behind the viewable display area) (see Sawyer, Fig. 5), the material of the bars being flexible (i.e. the bars scroll along with the display), Radley-Smith teaches one of the sides of the flexible display being provided with bars (12A), which are positioned extending substantially parallel to the axis (i.e. the 12A bars are parallel with the axis of rolling) (see Radley-Smith, Fig. 1-3, Col. 12, Lines 17-41), the bars being shaped along adjacent sides such that, in the unrolled state of the flexible display, abutting sides of adjacent ones of the bars provide a stiffened support structure for the flexible display (i.e. the bar style support system of Radley-Smith when deployed in the form of Sawyers retention system can be adjusted to match to side of

the display that is at the back of the viewer instead of the front) (see Radley Smith, Fig. 11, Col. 16, Lines 35-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the tread like bar enforcement structure parallel to the rolling axis of Radley-Smith to the flexible display protection system of Sawyer in order to create more flexible layout for the display system where a watch style bar assembly is adopted so that the flexible system of display of Sawyer can be extended to application such as wrist mounted design (see Radley-Smith Col. 2, Lines 30-50).

As to claim 21, Sawyer teaches a flexible display device assembly according to claim 20, wherein the contact between the bars and the display is limited to a center line on each bar (i.e. since the bars of Sawyer are attached on the centerline and as only the orientation addition is taken from Bradley-Smith the structure of all of the bar must be consistent with the original design) (see Sawyer, Fig. 5).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 1, 6-9, and 19 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 11-12 and 20-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments filed 1/8/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In page 5 of the replay the applicant argues regarding claims 11-12 and 20-23 that the prior art Sawyer and Radley-Smith fails to teach "stable stiffened state is the rolled up state", the examiner disagrees because the Radley-Smith's design is implement for the purpose of replace the Sawyer system which means that the tread like link support will function in a stiffened state in the rolled up state as the Sawyer required that the display when rolled up has greater structure solidarity than unrolled state.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Calvin Ma whose telephone number is (571) 270-1713. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chanh Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-7772. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Calvin Ma
March 29, 2009

/CHANH NGUYEN/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2629